

**PROPOSAL EVALUATION**  
**IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 1, FY 2010-2011**

---

<b>Applicant</b>	Gateway IRWM Authority	<b>County</b>	Los Angeles
<b>Project Title</b>	Gateway Regional IRWMP Planning Grant	<b>Grant Request</b>	\$950,000
		<b>Total Project Cost</b>	\$1,357,000

**Project Description** The Gateway Regional IRWMP Planning Grant proposal is for the development of an integrated regional water management plan (IRWMP) for the cities of the Los Angeles Gateway Region (Gateway Region).

**Evaluation Summary**

<b>Scoring Criterion</b>	<b>Score</b>
Work Plan	12
DAC Involvement	8
Schedule	8
Budget	8
Program Preferences	7
Geographic Balance	0
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>43</b>

- **Work Plan** The work plan meets the criterion but is not fully supported. Some of the work tasks lack sufficient detail and clarity. Further, given the physical connection between the Gateway IRWM region and the Greater Los Angeles County IRWM region, in order to effectively plan and address regional concerns (storm water management, wastewater treatment and recycling, etc.) cooperation between the two regions on the larger regional scale is necessary. However, throughout the work plan, there is a lack of acknowledgment that these two regions overlap and insufficient to non-existent information provided to document how the two regions will cooperate and integrate their planning activities.
- **DAC Involvement** The work plan provides tasks for facilitating and supporting DACs within the IRWM region, but does not sufficiently detail the process to be used. Applicant notes the Region is a high-needs population with a significant number of DACs. The IRWMP project review process in Task 4.11 stated that it will take into account the unique needs of the various DACs in the Gateway Region and verify those needs are met or mitigated through the IRWMP. Task 2.2 includes the development of a process to reach all stakeholders (including often-underrepresented groups) and to identify additional stakeholders in the region throughout the Plan process. However, the applicant did not adequately discuss or provide specific details on how it will ensure active participation and continuous engagement in the IRWM planning process.
- **Schedule** The schedule fully addressed the criterion but was not fully supported. The schedule is consistent with the work plan and budget but lacks detail for some tasks. The public review/comment period for Draft Plan review is not included in the schedule. Also, the submission of quarterly/final reports is not included on the schedule, although their submittal is listed as a task in the work plan.
- **Budget** The criterion is fully addressed but is not fully supported. The budget is consistent with the work plan and schedule and meets the funding match requirement. While adequate support is provided to document in-kind services, documentation supporting \$100,000 already incurred in the planning process is limited.
- **Program Preference** Seven program preferences (include regional projects/programs, effectively integrate water management programs/projects, address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities, climate change response actions, practice integrated flood management, protect surface water and groundwater quality, and ensure equitable distribution of benefits) were adequately addressed.
- **Geographic Balance** Not Applicable